P. VITHALRAO - TYPIST

Shop No. 16, 52C, Union Bldg., Nawshir Bharucha Marg,
Opp. Grant Road Station (W), Bombay - 400 007.

CASH MEMO

Date: 31st August 1987

Name Shri Balsekar

Nature of work Typing

Number of pages 64 Carbon copies 1 Spacing

Typing on ________ side/s. Envelope required Yes/No.

Received Rupees One Hundred & Twenty eight Only

Charge Rs. 128=00

Advance/Less Rs. —

Rs. 128=00

Received payment in full.

P. Vithalrao

P. VITHALRAO.

71

1-4 Full scape 1 1/2 x 8 single side

There is incomprehension because efforts to comprehend by reasoning ~~it~~ are made by a split-mind divided into subject-and-object, whereas direct apprehension can take place only in whole-mind.

Problems will never cease when the thinking is from the split-mind of the individual. Problems can never arise when the thinking is from the ~~view~~ whole-mind of totality.

Birth, life and death are certainly illusions but the basic illusion is that of there being ~~any~~ an objective entity supposed to experience these illusory occurrences. And the corollary illusion of space and time without which concepts such an objective entity could never appear to experience anything whatever. Indeed, in the absence of the space-time concept the manifestation of the phenomenal universe itself could not have occurred because in the absence of space no object could have been extended in three dimensions, and in the absence of time or duration no object could have been cognized and no experience could have been suffered.

It must follow, therefore, that all phenomena (including the sentient objects) can only be conceptual appearances in consciousness, perceived and cognized by consciousness itself, through sentient objects (which are part of the manifestation) by means of the dichotomy between subject and object, each sentient object being the subject of the other.

It must also follow therefore, that nothing has <u>really</u> happened, and that any religious elaboration on this matter can only relate to and inhere in the phenomenal universe which itself is conceptual.

Non-Existence –

We have forms only because we have been conceptually extended in "space" and protracted in "time" (duration). Without such conceptual extension in space and protraction in duration, we are ~~formless~~ formless, and therefore without birth and ~~death~~ life and death. Eternally what we are is "I – I", the absolute subjectivity.

When all phenomena in relativity are perceived as illusory and therefore non-existent, what is apperceived is the nothingness that remains.

The master key to all doors of ignorance and incomprehension is the apperception that nothing in relativity exists, not even knowledge.

Thought — conceptualizing and objectivizing — is the trap, but once it is recognized as such it can no longer function as a trap: the witnessing of the trap renders it innocuous.

All thought must necessarily refer to a person or thing and an event concerning them. In other words, all thought is based on the existence of space-time; and "space-time" is not some thing perceptible or cognizable; and therefore, all persons, all things and all events must necessarily be nothing but conceptual, and therefore unreal.

Life has meaning only because we can perceive one another, and perceiving of things can take place only because they can be extended in space and protracted in time. ~~But~~ However, space-time is not something objective and substantial but only a notion, a concept. Therefore? Perceiving of things must also be a concept, and, more importantly, "life" and living, therefore, must necessarily be a concept and therefore unreal.

The "present" does not exist because even before it has been perceived and conceived as such, it has become the past. The same applies to the future when it has become the present. And the past is merely an impression, a recollection in memory, while the future is an uncertain presumption. The presence, therefore, which always captures the present moment must necessarily be an entirely different measurement or dimension outside the flow of phenomenality — the Intemporality that we are, the noumenality of all phenomena, the subjective potentiality.

Suffering, positive or negative (sorrow or joy) can only be experienced by an identified "you" known as "me" — never by "I" because I have no objective quality to experience any sensation whatsoever.

Sound as such is heard and is then dead, but "hearing" lives because like all functioning it is noumenal. Leave sound to itself and hear the hearing instead.

Enlightenment cannot alter our natural state. On the contrary, it reveals what we have always been, since before time ever was.

What is generally called "humility" is only negative pride. True humility is the absence of any entity to be proud.

With whom can I quarrel? There is no "other" either to hate or to love.

Objectivity and existence are synonymous terms. Phenomenally, as science sees it, ~~only that~~ what can be known to exist is only that which is objective, and subjectivity cannot thus be said to exist because, without any objective quality, it can have no demonstrable existence. Noumenally, as metaphysics sees it, an object is merely an appearance in consciousness and is therefore an illusion.

Memories never relate to actions, only to reactions.

Why blame someone as the cause of something? He, like all of us, ~~are~~ is only an effect.

We are conditioned to believe that we are what is present and not what is absent. When there is apperception we find that we are not what is present but what is absent.

Infinity can be conceived, though rather vaguely, as unlimited space, and intemporality as unlimited time, but it is impossible to conceive the absolute absence of space and time. What is more, we have no words for these conceptual absences. But then anything that is objectifiable must be conceivable. Therefore, the indisputable fact is that the inconceivability of the absolute absence of space-time proves that the inconceivable can only be that which ~~doe~~ itself does the conceiving. In other ~~just~~ words, ~~as the~~ ~~spa~~ conceiving as such, while conceiving, cannot conceive its own conceiving, just as the

eye cannot see its own looking. In other words, the absolute absence of space-time must obviously be precisely what we are who cannot conceive it.

What was "I" before I was born? What was "I" a hundred years ago? I have the intuitive insight that "I" WAS — before the concept of conceiving could be conceived. That state of what I was is inconceivable because the very condition of conceivability (consciousness) became superimposed on what I am as "I-I", the potential plenum — the Noumenon not conscious of itself in its primordial state. Consciousness is the conceiving ~~and~~ — that which does the conceiving — and therefore cannot conceive itself: the eye cannot see its own looking, the camera cannot photograph its own action.

Objective existence is an appearance, an illusion in consciousness. Non-objective existence is such consciousness in which the objective existence appears.

Noumenality cannot appear as noumenality but only as phenomenality. The noumenal invisible ~~man~~ can "appear" only in phenomenal clothing.

"Living" happens when what-we-are, in its functioning, extends itself in space in three dimensions as volume and elaborates itself in duration. When that process ceases, we are no longer extended in space and no longer elaborated in sequential duration, space-time too ~~disappears~~ ceases and the apparent universe dis-appears. "Living" is thus a spatial illusion and "dying" is a temporal illusion, the whole process constituting a spatio-temporal illusion based on the serializing of the three-dimensional "stills" or "quanta" that is known as quanta. As what we are, we have never lived and cannot die.

Karma is the result of volitional action — and the conceptual bondage. It is the cause of the conceptual rebirth, although the "re" is a tautology because appearances occur every *kshana*, every split-second. Without the volitional element, ~~the~~ what appears as a deed (done by the sage) is not really a deed done by any "one" but the *doing* of the totality — "prajnya"

There cannot be any "thing" without "volume"; and volume would not be perceivable without "space", or cognizable without "time" or duration. Since space-time is not an object but only a concept, a notion, it needs no further explanation to ~~accept~~ prove, that every "thing", every phenomenon, every event, can only be an appearance, an illusion, a concept without substance, and "life" must also be a concept.

---

5 All there is, is the natural process of *noumenon phenomenalizing noumenality* in the dualist mechanism, whereby *perceiving* appears to occur, in which phenomena are extended in "space" and protracted in "time" (duration). The perceiving object (the sentient being) ~~percei~~ and the perceived object are merely a part of the mechanism, and have no other relevance: there is only *perceiving*.

"Life" is a concept extended in space-time, only an ~~image~~ appearance in consciousness, an image in the mind. Conceptually also, death is only an apparent absence of life, just as ~~death~~ life is the absence of death. And, if thus there is no factuality as life or death, obviously there cannot be any factual entity as an entity concerned with either life or death. "What-we-are is the unmanifest; it is manifested in the space-time appearance of "live-ing", ~~and~~ which dis-appears as "dieing". No entity as such is involved

---

The biggest impediment to the apperception of what-we-are is the difficulty of abandoning the concept of a live-er of life and a die-er of death as a factual entity, and of accepting the phenomenal manifestation of live-ing and die-ing, one being the absence of the other. ~~the only~~ It is only necessary to apperceive that living is the <u>appearance</u> in space-time of the phenomenal manifestation of the unmanifest Noumenon that we are, and dying is its <u>disappearance</u>.

The spatio-temporal framework is only a mechanism which enables us to experience phenomenally what we are noumenally. If that medium of space-time is objectified into something independently external to ourselves, it constitutes "bondage".

When "I" remain in the subjective intemporality of the <u>presence</u> of each "<u>Kshana</u>" (split-second), there is no objective duration in which to experience either pain or pleasure: nirvana of equanimity prevails. But when the "Kshana"s are horizontally connected into duration, the subjective whole-mind gets split into horizontal duality, the time-sequence which is the basis of all objectivization, the samsara.

6

The "me" concept ~~is~~ depends upon and appears to exist subject to temporal extension in ~~duality~~ duration, and neither has any objective quality whatever. In fact, the "me-concept" and the "time-concept" are dual, inseparable aspects of what is misconceived as objective existence and together form the foundation of the notion of "bondage". If space-time is continued to be regarded as objectively factual and independent of the perceiver of it, the "me-concept" as the perceiver-subject must remain, but if the concept of duration is seen as invalid, as an essential part of our appearance in extension, then the "me-concept" will also be seen to be equally invalid.

The desire of someone to know what-he-is can arise only in a state of duality (of subject and object), in a state of objectivization and movement where objects need duration to be seen in movement, in a state of temporality. Such a desire cannot arise in a state of unicity. In unicity, what-we-are is Eternal; in duality, we are Time, duration.

We *are* what we experience. Experiences conceptualized and diversely named as mutually contradictory sensations, emotions etc. cannot be anything separate from and independent of the cognizing of them. Their conceptual objectification as independent entities experienced by a "me" is an erroneous notion to which we have become conditioned.

In deep sleep there are no experiences of any kind because the very basis of all experience — the "I AM" concept — is absent. When the "me-concept" is absent, its twin aspect, the "time-concept" (duration) is also inevitably absent. In deep sleep all experiences disappear because in the absence of the "time-concept", the experiencer himself as the "me-concept" is absent.

/ Our conditioning is such that we consider ourselves as "belonging" to the past because we remember it, but actually we have already had the past and it is over for us. Do we not rather belong to the future which is going to have us? Actually, the past and the future, and the present as the supposed essential link between them as two entities, are as conceptual as the equator. Perhaps we would live more freely with less tension if we were to live on the basis of belonging to the future rather than to the past.

The laying of a bet and the winning or losing of it is one sequential event. We are used to accepting that we have won or lost because of laying the bet. Could it not be seen equally plausibly that the laying of the bet was because of the winning or the losing of it?

The notion that the future is the result of the past is surely due to the fact that "memory" is only retroactive. This temporal illusion should disappear with the other illusions if we would see very clearly that our relationship with "time" is a non-objective one and that therefore our future no longer depends upon our past.

Why does one suffer? As long as there is any "one" to suffer, he will suffer: "one" denotes separation and separation means conflict, suffering.

The seeker seeks enlightenment, wants to know his true nature. He goes from one Guru to another and he is delighted when there are some what he calls spiritual "experiences". But he almost always misses the most important point: no psyche-soma, no apparent individual seeking anything as an autonomous entity — and thinking and acting in that capacity — is capable of apperceiving anything significant concerning its true nature. The whole and ultimate truth is that all "existing" is objective, and objective existence is only a notion.

8/ The experiencing of pain (or pleasure) is part of the total functioning (which is noumenal), and is at that stage impersonal and non-objective, having no relation to an individual experiencer. Simply, there is pain or pleasure. It is only when the experiencing is interpreted (through the dualistic process of subject/object) as an experiencer experiencing an experience in time sequence that the element of noumenal, impersonal functioning is lost in the duality of objectivization.

This applies to all thinking and feeling, depending on whether or not it is interpreted as thought and emotion.

"Life" is objective subjection to experience, and living is experience in ~~duration~~ time-sequence, but what-we-are is the non-objective. What constitutes bondage is being identified with that object which is suffering experience (positive or negative, pleasure or pain). Freedom or emancipation is being this experience.

Experiencing means being sentient. It is ~~to~~ being the object of experience that brings on the notion of identification and bondage.

Phenomenally, we are that sentience (an aspect of consciousness) which makes experiencing possible, the experiencing which means "living" when extended in duration. Experiencing needs an objective medium, the psychosomatic apparatus, to express itself, and bondage arises when there is identification with this medium as the pseudo-entity.

Sentience (or consciousness) spatially extended in duration is our self-nature phenomenally, — not so extended in space-time is what-we-are noumenally.

"Sudden enlightenment" has been explained (by Hui Hai) as "a means of getting rid of conceptual thinking," and enlightenment as "just the apperception that enlightenment is not anything to be obtained or attained by "anyone".

In other words, there is really no seeker as a subject nor any enlightenment as an object to be attained, because "duration" in which something can "exist" is only a notion, a concept. Enlightenment is just the apperception that we are what we have always been (not that "we" already have "it"), that nothing at all has "happened", that nothing can happen because duration has no veracity.

What we are nonmenally is "sentience" not aware of sentience. Unconscious sentience becomes conscious of sentience only in the phenomenal process of objectifying what-it-is, as sentient phenomena. Sentience may also be called "presence", and unconscious presence (nonmenally) becomes conscious of presence only in the objectifying of what-it-is as present phenomena. Only phenomena — objects — can be sentient and present; but so manifested, conceptually in space-time, they cannot have any autonomy whatsoever as they are only appearances in consciousness, in a conceptual universe which is itself devoid of factuality as it is an objectification like any form of psychic manifestation such as a dream.

Sentient and present phenomena have their only "being" in nonmenal sentience or presence which (unextended in conceptual space-time) latter are total phenomenal potentiality.

Phenomena are consciousness. All that is sensorially perceived is consciousness, and the perceiving sentience is what-we-are as the phenomenal experience of consciousness, which is the noumenon.

The teaching of all Masters is simply to give up "thinking". "Thinking" means conceptualizing, fabricating objects in mind. So long as conceptualizing goes on, what-we-are is out; as soon as conceptualizing ceases, what-we-are is in. We are what subsists when objectivization is absent.

I am as all beings. I exist as all appearances. I am experienced as all sentience. I am cognized as all knowing.

10 I am being, unaware of being, but the being that I am is all being. I do not think, I do not do, I do not feel, but your thinking, doing, feeling is only mine. I transcend all appearance, but I am immanent therein.

We cannot be aware of Awareness, we cannot cognize that which is cognizing because That is subjectivity and cannot be cognized by an object as another object. In fact the need to cognize our "wholeness" through the split-mind is itself the obstruction which prevents apperception of what-we-are. Such apperception requires that the split-mind must be in abeyance: the "me" must be absent for Awareness to be present. Knowing this fact, having this understanding is not awareness of awareness but knowledge; and all knowledge is conceptual, inhering in the space-time continuum. There is, however, a solution of continuity between knowledge and Awareness, until knowledge gets merged in Awareness.

The traditional phrase "crossing over to the opposite shore" is liable to the most unfortunate misunderstanding if it is supposed to mean the crossing over of what-we-are to ~~~~ the objective shore where there would be a transformation ~~to~~ into what-we-are-not! The crossing over simply cannot refer to an entity because then it would mean that the entity is what-we-are! All that is needed is a "turning over of the mind" from objectifying externally to an integration internally, a returning of the senses to their source, a reversing (as Maharaj used to say) from durational thought and feeling to immediate apperceiving without any extension in space-time. And then would occur the release from bondage, a release from the false identification with an illusory phenomenal entity.

It is because he does not exist (otherwise than as a <u>concept</u> in mind) that man is not able to <u>conceive</u> that he does not exist: "a concept cannot conceive its own conceptual inexistence."

Shen Hui makes a clear distinction between Awakening which is sudden, and Deliverance thereafter which could be gradual. This is a most useful notional distinction which could clear a considerable amount of confusion. What is necessarily sudden is the shock of relative comprehension with absolute apprehension which results in the healing of the split-mind (into subject and object) into its wholeness, and thus makes possible, through the cessation of durational thought, deliverance from "bondage" to our conceptual universe while witnessing replaces phenomenal involvement.

Huang Po: "A perception, sudden as thinking, that subject and object are one, will lead to a deeply mysterious wordless understanding; and by this understanding will you awake to the truth of Chan."

The fact that we, as separate entities, expect to transform and perfect ourselves into enlightened entities shows the intensity and extent to which we have been conditioned. "We" are only phenomenal appearances, dreamed characters playing out their respective roles in the dream-play. How can an appearance perfect itself? Only awakening can make the dreamed character disappear. Only dis-identification with the supposed entity can bring about re-cognition of our true identity. And this cannot happen until the supposed volition has been surrendered.

If effort is needed at all, it is not in order to see the simple truth that the Masters have given us but to disabuse ourselves of the educated conditioning we have received ever since we became conscious of ourselves. And that is the difference between enlightenment and deliverance — the period necessary for disidentification from what-we-are-not.

What is <u>interpreted</u> as ~~$~~ happiness and its opposite as suffering are merely positive and negative experience. When there is no longer the conceptual ego-entity as the experiencer, neither can be present any longer in duration, and what remains is what tradition describes as <u>sat-chit-ananda</u>, the three-fold division being only a notional convenience.

12

Happiness, being dependent on duration, is only an effect of memory. ~~However~~ Whatever the length of the duration in a time-sequence, it is not the event as it is occurring that you "enjoy" but always a memory. When you bounce because you have had an unexpected good news, it is because of a departure from a norm. Happiness as such does not exist except as an interpretation from memory of one's own intemporal nature, a mere reflection of the inherent <u>sat-chit-ananda</u>.

An experience is experienced always by a "me" represented by a sensorial apparatus through which experience is suffered psycho-somatically. "I" cannot suffer an experience. Experience, an interpretation of a sensorial reaction to a stimulus, is the objective functioning of what "I" am. "Living" itself, then, is the experiencing by the manifold "me"s as the objective functioning of what I am.

I can apperceive that I am "It" because It is all there is, but I can never <u>know</u> what "It" is, ~~(because otherwise It would be an object, a "thing")~~ except conceptually, because otherwise It would be a "thing". We can talk about "sleep" in the waking state, but we can never <u>know</u> ~~it~~ sleep. "It" is presence unconscious of its presence.

What we are conceiving as appearance is what we are, perceiving it with our five senses and cognizing it with our sixth sense (mind). We are all there is, and we are what we could ever experience at any time.

Every sentient being as an object is only an appearance in consciousness (or mind), and his subjectivity is the source of every possible experience. It is therefore by experiencing the apparent universe that every sentient being is the source of the universe. What this means is that the fundamental nature of all phenomena is the perceiving thereof. "We" are both the source and the appearance — and neither. Noumenon and phenomenon are neither two, nor different, nor are they any "thing". Phenomenally, they are transcendence, and noumenally they are immanence. This is the explanation, unnecessary in apperception, of the apparently contradictory statements of the Masters which find their integration when the split-mind of duality gets healed into its wholeness.

Science has built its conceptual structure on the shifting sands of sense-perception, in a framework of illusory space-time which science makes no effort to explain or justify. It is only metaphysics which provides an acceptable explanation of the manifested universe which is sensorially perceived and experienced by all sentient beings from insectival to human. In recent years, however, science has been forced to come to certain conclusions firmly accepted by metaphysics for centuries.

Whatever people may think of you is their thought, objectified in their own aspect of mind called "memory". It cannot have anything to do with you, with what you are or are not.

"I" (and every sentient being can say it) have innumerable "selves" some most admirable and others most despicable. Each thinks he acts according to his own wishes, but actually he merely reacts to impulses. The totality of such reactions from the different "selves" is what is known as "living". What really "acts" is a functioning, an acting which is not reacting, called prajnya, "a transcendent noumenality, immanent as phenomenality, objectifying what it is as what we appear to be, by means of dualistic manifestation."

It is very necessary to be quite clear about the distinction between an object and an objectivization. A concept or appearance in mind is not an object but an objectivization — something not "made" but "seen". It would seem that anything "seen" needs a "see-er", which is indeed the apparent mechanism of duality, but there is none: no thing seen and no see-er. The phenomenal "objects" have no phenomenal "subject": they and their see-er constitute the "see-ing", which is noumenal functioning. No such thing as an object has ever existed and therefore no subject is necessary: a "subject" is merely an invented theoretical entity devised in order to account for supposed objects. It is the Noumenon that objectifies all appearance in the consciousness of its presence which arises with the first primal thought "I AM".

Both existence and non-existence — positive and negative existence — are conceptual and therefore phenomenal. It is the absence of both that constitutes the truth: their mutual extinction is noumenon, their phenomenal absence is noumenal presence.

It is a measure of our conditioning over thousands of years that only the objective seems to make sense, and that therefore all these years convoluted simili and tortured ~~words~~ phrases and sentences have been employed in an effort to objectivize the unobjectivizable. Objectivization posing as the only truth is surely in fact a superstition encouraged by science. All such efforts to objectivize the unobjectivizable have driven us into a state of psychic paralysis that prevents apperception of the ~~s~~ truly simple truth which can be intuitively felt in a single moment's silence of the mind. Indeed such efforts have ~~made~~ turned what is intuitively extraordinarily simple and clear into an obscure object wrapped in a mysterious confusion. Any object can only be in one place, what-we-are is present everywhere, wherever "we" happen to be: objectively absent but eternally present non-objectively.

Light, if it goes in search of darkness, will find its ~~own~~ absence. We cannot be sensorially aware of noumenon because that is precisely what we are. The presence of noumenality in phenomenality can only be cognized as absence. Noumenon and phenomenon are eternally separate as concepts: noumenal absence is phenomenal presence and vice versa; the presence of light is the absence of darkness. But, unconceived, they are forever inseparable, and that identity is the essential identity.

Having found himself awake to the Truth that phenomenality is only an objectivization in consciousness, the Buddha must have become suddenly aware of his own phenomenal inexistence. But his compassionate heart, it is said, wept for all those who believed in their personal existence and thereby bore the appalling burden of responsibility for "their" every little "action". But then, however agreeable or disagreeable the dream, the experience can belong only to the dream and the dreamed.

15

The conceptual nature of the universe and of the conceiver of it may not be seen in its inevitable totality unless it is apperceived that space-time extension is a functional element of all perceiving, without which nothing whatever could be perceived or conceived, that the universe does not appear in an everlasting context of permanent space-time extension, but comes into apparent existence simultaneously with the space-time extension as a medium, and finally that the perceiving of the universe is essentially noumenal and singular whereas its conceiving is apparently plural.

Most of the books and articles seem to be written from the viewpoint of a supposedly autonomous — and therefore, identified, bound and trussed — individual. Why write from a position of ignorance? Or is it that the writers are afraid that to do otherwise would be considered pretentious? If there has been pure apprehending, why not write from the position of authority? If there has not been pure apprehending, why write or speak at all? It could lead the deluded to further delusion!

Almost all sages have unequivocally asseverated that our conceptual bondage lies in the fact that we seem to "prefer" certain things as agreeable and reject others as not agreeable. The preference and rejection imply the exercise of volition by a supposed autonomous "entity". But there is no such entity: it is only an appearance in consciousness. Therefore there has been an identification with a supposed entity, and it can only be the disidentification ~~of~~ with the illusory entity which can suspend the exercise of the conceptual volition and thereby bring about the liberation from the conceptual bondage.

The teaching is so familiar, found in the esoteric aspect of every religion, that it is rarely accepted as a fact! We are repeatedly told that no phenomenal objectivization has any nature of its own, that it lacks objective existence. This can only mean that the object is nothing in itself, ~~except~~ but only what is apparently perceived. Each of "us" then, can only be whatever is perceived and conceptually interpreted as being. This means that "we" do not exist at all: ~~it~~ it is not "we" who perceive one another but a single source of perceiving — sentience — perceives through multiple percepts. Whatever the perception, conception and interpretation — depending upon whether it is a friend or foe who does it — the fact remains that you are totally devoid of objective existence, merely an appearance in consciousness, without any fixed identity, quality or attributes. On the other hand, subjectively, you are also completely devoid of identity, quality or attributes, and ~~you~~ phenomenally, you represent the subjective faculty which "produces" phenomenal manifestation. What you are is pure subjectivity, noumenon, the total potential.

It is essential to understand that there cannot be any such "thing" as an object, that an object is an appearance in consciousness without any other factual existence. In other words, the appearance of anything objective can only be the objectivization of that which is perceiving it, that is to say, ~~of~~ the perceiving itself, the cognizing, the being conscious of whatever is cognized — subject making an object of what it is. Such "subject" cannot be regarded as an entity since that would mean making an object of it: it can only be apperceived negatively neither as cognizer nor as cognized but inferentially as "cognizing", the functional aspect of what can only be regarded dialectically as "non-being". Finally it must also be apperceived that this subject that is inconceivable must necessarily be this which is vainly trying to conceive it and not succeeding.

Any curiosity about the fact of enlightenment is really based on its effect on the supposed individual, and ignores the fundamental fact that what are generally described as "experiences", involving "divine love", "ecstacy", "universal compassion" etc. are all affective phenomenal manifestations, rooted in temporality and based on the presence of the phenomenal "me", the ego which is itself the cause of all the conceptual bondage. If this were not so, the concerned individual would not have been interested in narrating them to others: the very apperception would have been based on the understanding that there is truly neither any "me" nor any "others".

It is quite possible that the phenomenon, suddenly freed from the burden of pseudo-responsibility and the consequent feelings of guilt, anxiety and allied feelings, gets an overpowering feeling of lightness and freedom. What is more, thenceforth, a sense of serenity may well replace cares and worries, but the point is that, as Ramana Maharshi and others have emphasized, the phenomenal events following the "experience" are not likely to be substantially altered, but would continue to be "those of a saintly as of a sinful personality", based on the essential make-up of that particular phenomenon. The point, however, is that whatever the events, they
17/ will be seen as spontaneous, noumenal and totally impersonal, and therefore right and proper in the circumstances from the viewpoint of Totality.

The one supreme understanding without which no understanding could be valid — and with which no other understanding is necessary — is the final and total absence of oneself as an entity*: the understanding that objective absence is subjective presence.

The basic riddle about liberation is that a self-supposed entity cannot be liberated unless it is abolished, and it cannot abolish itself since it is self-supposed. The answer cannot be found within the parameters of sequential duration and spatial extension. It is only by springing out of the concept of time and breaking the chain of space-time bondage that the answer can be found — and then, there would be no "one" to want an answer.

Such an understanding, such a springing out of the concept of space-time, would mean an apprehension that there is neither "here" nor "there", neither "now" nor "then", neither "this" nor "that" — which all together would abolish opposing positions of the thinker in space-time. In other words, the true apprehension would need the <u>absence</u> of "space" and of a conceiver of space, of "time" and a conceiver of "time", of "self" and a conceiver of "self" — so that there could be an apperception of our own objective absence and the apprehension that "we" can never <u>know</u> what we <u>are</u>, since what-we-are is nothing objective that could possibly be known. Such an apperception must comport the clear understanding that the transcendence of the noumenal is surely the immanence of the phenomenal, that this apparent solution of continuity between the apparent events in ~~his~~ time-sequence and ~~their~~ their intemporal noumenality does not indicate any separation at all.

A lot of frustration would be avoided if we would but clearly understand once for all that, whilst we <u>are</u> the Absolute, uncognizable, That which is cognizing, the inevitable <u>fact</u> remains that what we can know of ourselves is nothing at all other than as the totality of objectivized phenomena, each of which cannot have any but conceptual existence as what "we" perceive and conceive as appearance.

18/

What is often forgotten when there is talk of affectivity — feelings and reactions — attributed to an "enlightened" sentient being cannot be other than the affectivity attributed to any other sentient being, for the simple reason that <u>the origin of both is noumenal</u>: both are phenomenal manifestations of what sentience is. The point is that ~~any~~ no direct manifestation of noumenal "affectivity" (even if such were conceivable) assumed in the case of an "enlightened" phenomenon could possibly be temporal or perceptible as such in time-sequence, except perhaps ~~ones~~ when <u>interpreted</u> as "grace", "serenity" or "equability". ~~is~~ In other words, the apparent affectivity of ~~both the only~~ all phenomena — "enlightened" or otherwise — are both the individualized representations in mind of the same sentience, and therefore no dualistic emotion can be sublimated. It is for this reason that we find two "enlightened persons" behaving in ~~a~~ decidedly different ways. It is for this reason too that Nisargadatta Maharaj used to say, "thoughts, and even desires do arise in mind but <u>they are not pursued</u>."

The real problem concerning "bondage" and "liberation" is that the self-identified concept (a sentient being making an object of its space-time appearance) cannot abolish "itself" which is the concept of its own identity. The only conclusion that can be drawn, after a long history of the struggle for "liberation", is that a sentient being, as a phenomenon or an appearance in space-time, ~~can~~ can never perceive or conceive what it <u>is</u> non-phenomenally since what it <u>really</u> is That which is subjectively cognizing. While this dialectic understanding — that what-we-are cannot be anything objective to be cognized — does not <u>in itself</u> mean release from the apparent bondage of identification, it is certainly capable of producing an intensity of conceptual negativity which could bring about the apperception of what we must inevitably <u>be</u> through the healing of the split-mind into its pristine wholeness.

When metaphysics describes a man as a concept, the difficulty in understanding it is the fact that man is alive and that he can be touched. But the fact of the matter is that both attributes of "being alive" and "being touchable" are also conceptual. Sentience — visual, auditory, tactile, gustatory, olfactory — is the basis of the "animate" variety of phenomena, and the <u>interpretation</u> of a senseperception is inevitably a concept, whatever the difference phenomenally because of relative interpretation. A concept exists in <u>mind</u> only, whether it is a sensorial
19 concept like a man ~~or~~ and ~~a beetle~~, or a psychic concept like a god; and, what is not often realized, what is not conceptual cannot even <u>appear</u> to exist. In other words, whatever is cognizable, whatever is knowable cannot be anything but a concept.

Ramana Maharshi accepted that while mind (split-mind) must ultimately be destroyed, it is only mind which must be used like a stick to take us to a point where the stick may be given up. All that the split mind (or divided mind or relative mind) can do to bring us face to face with what-we-are is to bring us face to face with what-we-are-not (conceptual objectivization). Having understood by dialectic reasoning that our whole life is nothing but conceptual and that we can know nothing that is not conceptual (including ourselves who seem to be conceiving it all), we find ourselves, in phenomenal presence, so to speak ~~with~~ facing our non-objective nature or noumenal absence.

We could in all truth say that we are all the subjective "I" conceptually identified with objects cognized as "me", but in so saying we would run the danger of conceptualizing ~~S~~ the subjective "I" as some thing, and then we would continue to be bound by the same conceptual chains as before.

Perhaps the most difficult thing for the split-mind to understand is that the split-mind cannot understand whole-mind. In trying to find out what-you-are, you (the identified supposed entity) by using the split-mind are only examining empirically a dualized expression of what you are: there is no "thing" to find and no "one" to find anything. The fact is that you are aware — profoundly aware — of what you are, but superficially your split-mind tells you that you are not. And the tragic joke is that you cannot awaken yourself to the original profound awareness because sleepers do not awaken them-selves by an act of volition — it only happens when it is due to happen. Indeed, whatever "you" (a mere objectivization in mind) try to do can only prevent it happening. A double-bind? Perhaps, but the fact remains that there must be neither a doing nor a not-doing in order to let it happen when it will. So, nothing to be done at all? Nothing — except witnessing, without judging or choosing, whatever that is happening.

20/ ~~True enlightenment~~

Noumenality cannot be objectivized by any means whatever: it may be apprehended but can never be conceptualized or expressed accurately in words. Its apperception belongs to a non-relative in-seeing which is the integrality of ~~mind~~ whole-mind not divided into a ~~suppos~~ conceptual subject and its objects, which understands a doing without an apparent doer. When conceptualizing ceases, the split-mind is healed into whole-mind which retains its subjectivity.

True enlightenment is the apperception of the total absence of an entity either to be enlightened or not to be enlightened. There is in fact no question at all of any "disidentification" as such because there never has been any identification of one objective entity with another objective entity.

The phenomenal condition called "bondage" refers to the functioning of the split-mind in space-time context wherein the conceptual subject regards what it is as an object, as the perceiver of what appear as other objects. The understanding, the apprehension that this is not so and that "perceiving" is a space-time objectivization of the undivided — and indeed indivisable — condition of "being conscious" should demolish the mistaken entitifying of a split-mind concept, though its application may not be so easy.

The multiplication of objects by the splitting of "mind" into subject and its objects does not mean the multiplying of consciousness as such. With the understanding everything becomes an objectivization in consciousness and no subjective element is seen in phenomenality, except as reflected subjectivity like one source of light reflected in so many mirrors forming many diversified reflections. Consciousness or Whole-mind is, of course also a concept serving merely as a symbol for what-we-are, and it helps ~~to~~ apprehension until it brings about in certain cases a transformation into a "sage" who is integrated ~~into~~ with what-he-is, with what we all are. But it must always be remembered that being what it is, even the sage cannot know anything about it any more than others. Therefore, the essential understanding being incompatible with entitification, there could not have been any release from "bondage" if there continues to exist an "entity" enjoying any relevant experiences, however sublime and ennobling they may be.

N/

When your name is called out, you say you are "present". But what is present is only a form, an appearance to which a name is given. The real "you" is not what is present but what is absent as "I". This applies to all the "me"s and "you"s who are the multiple phenomenal presences in space-time extension of the absent singular noumenal "I".

We are so conditioned to accept the presence of an appearance that we accept the body as what we are. The truth, however, is that what we are is not the presence of what is present (as an appearance) but the absence of what is present or the presence of what is absent. The noumenal "I" cannot appear as such: the only way noumenon can appear is as a phenomenal appearance (in multiplicity) in consciousness. "I" can appear only as a "you" or a "me", never as "I".

What most of the Disciples — Devotees — Idolators are doing is to worship the coffee-pot instead of drinking the coffee.

"I" am the apperceiving of all that is perceived, the seeing of whatever is being seen, the hearing of whatever is being heard, the knowing of whatever can be known, the doing of whatever can appear to be done, the feeling of whatever is being felt, the experiencing of all that is being experienced. I am awareness of anything and everything of which any sentient being can be aware. Can there be a "who" or "what" or "when" or "where" for the Infinite Intemporality that I am? That is why Ramana Maharshi, when he was dying, said, "Where could I go?"

For true perceiving, it needs to be very clearly understood that there is no I (me) here seeing any object there, nor is there any object there being seen by any I (me) here. There is only a seeing (appearing) of a seen-object and a corresponding assumption of an I-subject — both the seen-object and the assumed I-subject being appearances in consciousness, concepts in mind. This seeing, as a phenomenon is, it must be clearly understood, is not separate from its noumenon, because as functioning it is an aspect of the subjectivity.

22 The functioning as such, for all sentient faculties is inevitably "direct", non-volitional functioning, a temporal expression of intemporality — "I"-functioning — when there is no dualistic subject/object interpretation by a conceptual autonomous individual entity in temporality. But when so interpreted, what is seen or what is otherwise sensorially conceived acquires name and form (nama-roopa) and becomes a dead concept.

When interpreted by a conceptual autonomous entity "living" becomes phenomenal living, causation, dream-phantasy, whereas uninterpreted it is noumenal living — the subjective apperceiving of an objectivization of what we are.

The only necessary understanding is that what-I-am-here-and-now is no object. This itself would be conceptual if what-I-am is seen as that kind of an object which is non-object! What-I-am is not a non-object, but total objective absence — which is total subjective presence as potentiality, totally unaware of absence and presence both. Absolute, phenomenally, is negative while objects phenomenally are positive. Therefore, it is only by totally negating the positive that Absolute can be revealed.

If there is no interference from "you", you are "I", and then whatever you may be doing or not doing, it is "I" who will be doing it or not doing it — for there is no "you".

The only understanding is that there is no entity to be enlightened by any doctrine, and the only enlightenment is the understanding that there is no entity to be enlightened. Without this understanding, any kind of teaching or practice would only reinforce the illusion of such an entity.

Once it has been engraved in our minds that what-we-are cannot be any objective thing whatever, then it is possible to think in terms of our nature or suchness impersonally, and then perhaps we might understand that we have never been anything other than the dreaming of our lives, that the past-and-the future (the present becomes the past even before the processes of perception and cognition can be completed) is in fact a dream-structure. When do we cease dreaming? The apperceiving of our living-dream as such means in fact apperceiving what-we-were when acting out all the parts in our dream of life — and death — in the sequential duration. Have we ever been anything 23/ else other than the dreaming of our lives? Could there be anything else for us to be? In phenomenality we are the functioning aspect of the noumenal potential. We are the noumenal dreamer and the phenomenal dreaming, conceptually apart but noumenally quite inseparable: The dreamer and the dreaming are not two.

When you read something or hear something, the reading or hearing should take place in a still mind, that is to say, without making the slightest effort to understand intellectually (without having a mental debate with the writer or the speaker) and without letting the mind wander. In this receptivity the writer or the speaker can get through to you directly without any mental blocks. It is up to you to decide later whether you agree or not — after first having clearly understood what was being put up to you — and come to your own conclusion.

Whatever conception others may have about me (and I may have about myself) is all that I could be at that moment of time. There is no "I" (me), no "you", no "it" — no factual "thing" — other than as a conceptual objectification in consciousness, other than as an appearance, in a spatio-temporal context, in consciousness. What we are is the perceiving and conceiving. There is no entity to cognize and no entity to be cognized. Consciousness is just a ~~symbol~~ symbol for the cognizing process, a symbol whereby the phenomenal manifestation of "cognizing" may be indicated in space-time context — the cognizing process itself being a conceptual manifestation in imagined space-time.

Cognizing (along with the other five faculties of sentience) is actually a dualistic expression of consciousness being conscious, the functioning aspect of subjectivity (when consciousness-at-rest notionally becomes consciousness-in-movement). Therefore, what-we-are as noumenality cannot appear (become manifest or phenomenal) except as phenomenality.

This is all there is to "it".

The only Truth is that "truth" is totally beyond all forms of mental activity. The Truth is the absolute absence of any kind of knowledge

Consciousness is presence of presence, while unconsciousness is presence of absence. It is only in the absence of both consciousness and unconsciousness — only in the absence of the presence of ~~abs~~ presence and the presence of absence — that the Absolute is absolutely present.

Is the path ~~a~~ really "a long and arduous journey", "a perilous voyage across stormy seas", as Tradition makes it out to be? Not really. On the contrary, there is no "one" to go "anywhere", "any time" — neither any "place" nor any "placed" to be displaced. Why so? Because all phenomenality — the very appearance of the manifest universe — cannot take place in the absence of "space" and "time", and the space-time continuum is only a concept, quite unreal, merely a bubble that bursts in the nothingness of total negation : absolute negation of appearance (in the absence of a veritable space-time continuum) means total phenomenal absence. Without any "here" or "there", without any "who" or "what" without any "was" or "will be", without any "when" or "why", what remains is the nothingness of fullness or plenum, which ~~we~~ is what-we-are.

When we say that we want to see what-we-are, we inevitably think of what-we-are as a "thing", however strongly we deny it. But what we really <u>mean</u>, without being aware of it, is that seeing what-we-are means seeing into our "self-nature", which means the nature ~~of nature~~ or the "self" of <u>nature</u>, which in turn means not seeing any "thing" but seeing that which is seeing, the "functioning", the being — which is our self-nature: not <u>what</u> is apparently done but the act-of-functioning as such, functioning that is truly functional as an aspect of the noumenon ("Thy will be done") and not volitional.

We cannot <u>find</u> what-we-are because it is possible to find only ~~what~~ something we are not. We cannot <u>know</u> what-we-are because we are not somebody else we could know. If we would only forget — or even ignore — what we are not (conceptual extension in space-time as an appearance), we would remain whatever we have always been.

The point that is not easily comprehended is the fact that "pure" awareness, as subjectivity, cannot be aware of itself. What is to be understood is that pure awareness, non-objective awareness, is non-awareness; otherwise, if it implies self-awareness, it means awareness of an objective "self". What-I-Am cannot be aware because if I am aware of what I am, then what I am becomes the object of a subject that is aware of an object, and so on ad infinitum in a perpetual regression. This means, therefore, that it is quite impossible to be aware (or conscious) of what is being aware (or conscious), that there cannot be any objective "being" that is aware (or conscious): being aware (or conscious) as such cannot have any objective existence, only a subjective functioning.

If I am conscious of something, then I become the subject and the "something" becomes the object. The basis of consciousness is, therefore, duality. And this subject/object relationship can be a perpetual regression in duality, which can only stop when duality ends in unicity, when What-I-am, pure subjectivity, cannot be aware. It can only be awareness not aware of itself.

No object has any existence except as a percept conceptualized in consciousness, and therefore there cannot be a subject: "a subject" would necessarily be an object of another subject in a continuous perpetual regression, each conceptualized as "I" (me). A subject and an object in perpetual regression is the very basis and mechanism of phenomenality. The absence of a subjective factor as an ~~indo~~ entity independent of being an object is what constitutes relativity, and all that we know as knowledge is the result of ~~this~~ relative reasoning. The very existence of relative knowledge proves that there must be knowledge that is absolute. This absolute knowledge we can neither know nor possess. Why? Because this absolute, which can neither be denied nor negated, is a symbol for what-we-are.

26

Dialectically, it could be held that the very relationship between the relative and the absolute makes the relationship an interrelated one. But metaphysically, the ultimate pair of interrelated opposites or contraries are "the conceivable" and "the inconceivable", but what it does is to point beyond to the negation of both counterparts which arrives at the mind no longer split by interrelated opposites — the whole-mind or impersonal consciousness not identified with any pseudo-subject. Such transcendence of all conceptuality of the split-mind ~~is~~ may be called Noumenon, transcending the conceptual phenomenality and non-phenomenality.

Phenomena and consciousness are not different — phenomena are consciousness, and all that is sensorially perceived is also consciousness. And we are the perceiving sentience which, as such, is phenomenal experiencing of "consciousness", and "consciousness" is noumenon.

The apparent existence of phenomena is the apparent existence of "consciousness". But we can only be conscious of "consciousness" when we become aware of noumenal presence

---

Affective fixation on the personality of a Guru or Master can be a serious obstacle to what the Master himself may be trying to achieve because the Master himself becomes the gaoler holding the disciple in bondage, unwittingly though it ~~may~~ might be. A true Guru, like Nisargadatta Maharaj makes it repeatedly clear that treating the teaching as from one individual (however exalted) to another individual would be a complete mistake. It is as consciousness speaking to consciousness that the true Guru speaks.

The personality of the Guru is often

inherent but also many times is projected on to him by the disciple. Either way, the fact remains that the Guru's personality, if he is interpreted and regarded conceptually as the source of the teaching (as not a ~~vehicle as the Guru himself would asseverate~~) could be a very serious hindrance to "liberation". The true Guru would repeatedly asseverate that he does not exist as an individual and therefore has nothing to teach or to bestow, but he is only praised for his "humility" and his image further idolated!

Such craze for idolizing ~~on the~~ conceptual image of the Guru, it must be admitted, ~~a~~ is a phenomenon to be witnessed in the East and not in the West. The ideal situation would seem to lie at neither extreme but somewhere in the middle: not so far at one extreme where the Guru is seen merely as any other teacher ~~and~~ as in the West, nor at the other extreme in ~~where~~ the East where the disciple is supposed by Tradition to actually revere and idolize the Guru as the physical representation of the Absolute.

What-we-are is the inconceivable infinity in comparison with which what we-think-we-are (the psychosomatic apparatus) is merely an appearance, an insubstantial shadow. All that is necessary is the direct, intuitive apperception of this inevitable fact in order to remain in our true nature. And this apperception can only be sudden and instantaneous, and must necessarily exclude all personal efforts because any entity can only be a concept: otherwise such comprehension can only be a concept in temporal consciousness.

It is only in the absence of any entity to be either proud or humble — with total humility — and in absolute stillness of mind that it is possible to know what indeed we are.

No ~~cat~~ object can be by itself either good or not good, because ~~they~~ the attributes ~~arise only~~ in the supposition of a cognizer and some object cognized, that is to say, in the cognizing of the object by split-mind.

No object by itself is either good or not good — they are attributes which arise in the cognizing by a supposed cognizer of the object cognized by split-mind. The fact of the matter is that there has never been a cognizer nor has any thing been cognized — they are split aspects of the subjective functioning which is called cognizing.

The essential basic ~~error~~ in the understanding of what-we-are is the fact that we keep thinking in terms of a cognizer and the object cognized as being something substantial. Such thinking ignores what is fundamental, and clouds the fact that what-we-are is the cognizing, the subjective functioning of the total phenomenal manifestation. An apperception of this fact can take place only when one has been seduced or threatened or pushed into the conviction that both the cognizer and the object cognized are essentially an appearance, a hallucination, an illusion, a dream, and that the entire manifestation is the temporal, objective expression ~~had~~ of the subjectivity that we are as "I."

To ask why a rose should smell so sweet and something else so foul, or why a good man be so good and a bad man so evil is futile — indeed an exercise in otiosity undertaken by the split-mind, itself based on the division of subject and object, and capable of working only on the basis of relative reasoning in temporal duality. The split-mind is not capable of seeing its own source, the whole-mind or the impersonality of intemporality.

Some extent of the basic understanding intellectually — that what we appear to be is a fleeting shadow, a fragmentary and distorted reflection of the inconceivable immensity that we truly are — is, at least relatively speaking, not too difficult and therefore not too uncommon. However, only a small percentage of these people are likely to reach the totality of the understanding, an intuitive apperception which itself is what we are. This is because inspite of the intellectual understanding, the conditioning about their identity is too strong ~~from~~ for them to accept the absolute and total annihilation of that identity: they see the illusory character of the phenomenal universe and everything in it except that of themselves!

There are three aspects of cognizing:
a) perceiving phenomenally as the ordinary man does — a phenomenal subject perceiving phenomenal objects as others and as being "real"; (b) noumenal cognizing — phenomenality cognizing subjectively; and
(c) non-dual cognizing — apprehending of phenomenality and noumenality as not two, implying the dissolution of all interdependent opposites; this cognizing is pre-conceptual.

This is the notional ~~degrees~~ distinction in understanding made ~~by~~ in Buddhism: (a) mountains and rivers are cognized as such, that is to say, subject seeing object as <u>separate and real</u>; (b) mountains and rivers are no longer cognized as such, that is to say, object seen as subject itself — separate and unreal; (c) mountains and rivers are once more cognized as such, that is to say, subject and object seen as unreal but not separate. ~~This could be perhaps be put~~

The sentient world and the Absolute — the manifested and the unmanifest — are both indeed what-we-are, Consciousness: one in movement and temporal extension, the other static in stillness and repose.

29

Can there be a "self" without the "other"? The self and the other are the very basis of duality, of temporal manifestation as the interrelated opposites of subject and object. Both are empty concepts, images extended in conceptual space-time, cognized in consciousness by consciousness. One cannot exist without the other and in the absence of both in total negation, conceptualization ceases, and peace-holiness-unicity prevails in the presence of absolute absense.

Many masters have offered the unequivocal assurance that the total apprehension of the basic identity of conceptual opposites is itself enlightenment. What is more, the assurance extends to the degree that seeing such identity of even one such pair of opposites is sufficient because to see one is to see all. It matters not the least whether concepts are made about other and self, phenomenon and noumenon, presense and absense or whatever, because each such pair represents the aspect of the dichotomy of the mind in the process of conceptualization which is called duality. A return to wholeness of mind comes about in the absence of this process of duality, that is to say, non-duality or advaita which represents mind prior to conceptualization, "upstream" of all conceptualizing.

In other words, the process of duality entails a conceptual dichotomy of the impersonal perceiving into a pseudo-subject cognizing a pseudo-object, resulting in identification with a phenomenal object, a psyche-soma, assuming subjectivity. The absence of conceptualization means a return to wholeness of mind and disidentification with the phenomenal object — identification is referred to as "bondage" and disidentification as liberation or enlightenment.

107

An absence of the process of conceptualization means not perceiving phenomena in duality, not perceiving them as subject/object, self/other etc. ~~which~~ which in turn means the assimilation of the self-contradictory opposites resulting in a mutual negation of both. It must be noted, however, that such negation does not mean a union of the opposites (such union is psychologically impossible) but rather they abolish one another, resulting inevitably in a third concept of voidness. Therefore, and this is vitally important, we are still left with the concept of "voidness" which keeps us bound. What is necessary is ~~the neg~~ a further negation of the resulting absence (when presence and absence have assimilated and annihilated each other). Such final negation — the essential negation — is that of ~~the~~ whatever is conceptualizing the absences resulting from the assimilation of the interrelated opposites. The final negation is the negation of the comprehender in the understanding, leaving the understanding as pure apperception in which there is no room for anything else than the apperception itself.

Dialectic discriminative or discoursive treatment of the conceptual "opposites" or "complementaries" — all of which can be grouped under the single aspect of negative-positive — involves their being treated objectively as "nouns" so that in each case with their mutual reintegration psychologically the resultant concept is one of "voidness". This resultant voidness is essentially ~~based~~ a personal voidness based on ~~[illegible]~~ "I" and "you", and therefore its negation has to be the negation of both the subject and the object. So regarded — grouped under the pair "I" and "you" — the apperceiving becomes noumenal (without nouns) instead of phenomenal, although its expression must ~~necessarily~~ superficially remain dualistic, though basically non-dialectical, non-discriminative and non-discoursive ~~and~~ and therefore to be apprehended only as intuitive apperceiving. Such noumenal apperceiving is pre-conceptual, direct, without any scrambling by dialectical interference, without any reification or rationalization, which can only suggested by something like the "within" of Jesus Christ.

Light is ubiquitous in space, though the sky appears dark. It does not seek to shine, indeed it does not even know it shines. It has no conceptual existence other than its shining, which appears on objective reflection from sensorially perceived particles in the atmosphere. It "exists" only because it is an experience sensorially perceptible to us sentient beings: it exists merely as an appearance in our psyche, it has no knowable existence of its own. Therefore Light is an aspect of what-we-are: therefore, too, no matter which sentient being says it, "I" am Light, and Light is "I". "I" as Light manifest only in objectivity and if all apparent objects were removed, objectivity and I remain in the potentiality of the unmanifest Absolute.

31

What we appear to be, what we are phenomenally is conceptual, and so what we are non-conceptually (noumenally) must be non-conceptuality as such. Conceptually, what-we-are is forever unknown and unknowable in the apparent restrictions of space-time duality. Non-conceptually, what-we-are is the not-knowing of knowing, intemporal and infinite, neither any thing nor no-thing. Phenomenally, in duality, we are that which is conceptualizing (together with the concepts conceived); noumenally, in non-duality, we are up-stream of, prior to, conceptualization, and therefore, can neither conceive nor be conceived. It is quite important to remember that "we" do not exist as such and therefore "we" do not conceptualize — what-we-are is what is cognized as "conceptualizing."

In considering the question of bondage and the use of the pronoun "I", it is really a question of what is meant. If you speak as a psychosomatic phenomenon that considers itself a separate independent entity, acting (or not acting) on its own volition, then no matter how much you know, or how much you have read, or how much meditation you have done, you are very much in bondage. But in saying "I", even though it may appear to others that you speak and act like any other phenomenon, you are <u>not</u> in bondage if you do not regard that phenomenon ("me") as an autonomous entity possessing volition — independence of choice and action — because then ~~you~~ such phenomenon is not "in the saddle" and you are not identified with it.

Identification with a phenomenal object as such is not by itself bondage for such phenomenon cannot have any "ens", as in the case of a disidentified sage who ~~may~~ lives like any other person ~~but~~ and continues to use the person pronoun "I" without inhibition. It is the superimposition of autonomy and independence on the phenomenon as a separate entity that causes the apparent bondage (and Karma) which are the effects of an apparent "volition".

Nobody can say precisely what electricity is, nobody knows what consciousness is. Both are ~~terms~~ conceptual terms in dualistic language to denote a basic "energy" that enables appearances to appear and being to be. When the necessary contact is made, we know the result as "light" and "life", when contact is broken the result is "darkness" and "death". The point is that the source of "energy" remains intact, intangible and impersonal. What we are is consciousness, the basic energy, the vital current and not the manifestations.

"Self" and "<u>others</u>" cannot be abolished because there is no abolisher. But, being interdependent, their complement ~~p~~ results in mutual negation when seen as "<u>self and others</u>", the absence of which is what-we-are.

A phenomenon is a manifestation and must therefore necessarily be an aspect of noumenon; ~~just as~~ similarly spontaneous phenomenal action must be noumenal and such living (as that of a sage) is noumenal living, that is to say, non-identified living. It is identification with a suppositional "entity" (produced in the process of objectifying the operational centre which sentience needs in every psyche-soma), translated as an individual "ego-self" that is supposed to be born, to suffer and to die, that becomes subject to Karma (the process of Causality) and to bondage. Phenomena as such have no entity whether to be bound or to be free. The phenomenon is merely an appearance in mind, it is always the "entity" that is spurious, and the apparent problem is only one of identification.

The apparent problem of identification must be clearly understood. Phenomenality is only the objective elaboration or expression of noumenality; they are not different and therefore the question of identification between phenomenality and noumenality does not arise. It is the identification of noumenality, not with phenomenality as such, but with separated or discriminated phenomena that is the source of all the "trouble" because it entails the splitting of phenomenality into apparent subject and object and the assumption of subjectivity by what is essentially objective. The identification, then, is actually the attribution of subjective function to the objectivization of an operational centre in each phenomenon, such "centre" obviously being psychic just as the heart or the liver is somatic, and thus a part of the psychosomatic apparatus.

It should be quite easy to understand that the existence of an autonomous, volitional entity would be quite incompatible with the functioning of Totality, often spoken of as Prajnya.

The notion of bondage arises because the operational centre in each psyche-soma (~~through~~ on which the five senses depend for perception and cognition) is mistakenly considered as the subjective element of the objectivized phenomenon. But this operational centre is only a part of the phenomenal set-up and, as such, never could it have autonomy or volition. Sentience, or the real subjective functional element, is basically noumenal, whilst the operational centre in a sentient being is wholly cybernetic. In other words, the switch-board is being mistaken for the power-station, the reservoir for the source of the water, an electronic computer for the mind.

Phenomenally, we cannot know any present because the present has become the past before our senses could complete the process of recording it — there is, therefore, phenomenally only a supposed past and future; noumenally, there is no question of "past or future", only a <u>presence</u> to which space and time are irrelevant, presence-here-and-now, the centre from which all externalization takes place, knowable only in the total absence of conceptualization. Phenomena and space-time being inseparable, and their appearance interdependent, only phenomenal comprehension is possible so long as the concept of space-time is present. It is our dependence on the concept of space-time which by itself is responsible for the basic illusion of manifestation on which the notion of "bondage" rests.

Our "living" — as dreamed characters in the living dream — is directed from the noumenal functional centre (sentience, common to all psyche-somas). It is from this functional centre that all direct, spontaneous and inevitable action ("God's will" if that is preferred) gets initiated, and not from the phenomenal operational centre (personal to each psyche-soma) of an egocentric pseudo-subject of conceptualized objects, whose effects can only be appearance. An apperception of this fact means awakening to enlightenment.

"Bondage" is in fact nothing more than attachment to an imaginary "will" (or volition) which is the exercise of independent choice by a supposed entity with which what-we-are is identified, which is called by a certain name and which it regards as "me". But the "me" is merely an objectivization which cannot by itself do anything at all just as a piece of mechanism cannot act by itself autonomously. This absurd notion has been made possible by the assumption of an untraceable "entity" which takes charge of this mechanism. The result is conflict — experienced as suffering — based entirely on the mistaken need to act independently, volitionally. The in-seeing of this rather obvious position is awakening to enlightenment.

"We" are only actors, characters in a dream-play called "living", appearances in consciousness, who could not possibly have "volition" to choose or decide, accept or refuse. We are absurd clowns to imagine that we can "want" or "wish" or "hope" or "regret". What we are — as the noumenal "I" — are expressed phenomenally as the various aspects of subjective functioning — seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling and thinking — but "I" do not see, hear, taste, smell, feel or think. It is an object which "lives" sensorially (or, more accurately, "is lived" sensorially) and what-we-are — as "I" — is the sentience which makes "sentient beings" out of the psyche-somas. Without the suppositional "volition" of the objects, there is no bondage.

The notion of bondage depends on the essential condition of separation, the illusion of which is due to the apparent presence of objects whose cognizer is seen as their supposed subject. The fact of the matter is that the supposed subject is itself an object whose cognizer is nothing other than sentience which is the nature of cognition. In other words, the cognizer and the cognized together form the inseparable process of subjective functioning

The acceptance — with conviction not out of frustration — of the inevitable fact (a review of any one's life would confirm this "inevitability") that "we" do not have any volition or choice, and that we are "being lived" as characters in the dream-play that this waking state is, will clearly show that it is futile and stupid to worry about the future. Such acceptance will also bring about the understanding that (a) no action can be either correct or incorrect, right or wrong because any such thing would be an arbitrary judgment; (b) liking and disliking, or love and hate, are merely affective reactions of the illusory entity with only a conceptual existence; (c) all adjectives are as conceptual as the nouns to which they would be attached; (d) reasons and causes have nothing but conceptual existence in the absence of any "volition".

Noumenon and phenomena, the unmanifest and the manifest, are what might be called the original inter-related opposites — the one conceives the total potential and the conceives the totality of what is sensorially perceptible. The point is that all such interrelated opposites include each other, are not different but opposite aspects of what remains in their mutual negation of what is conceived — and that is the absence of no-phenomena, or That which was — and is — prior to the conceiving process, prior to the arising of consciousness as I AM.

Many Masters have confirmed — none has asseverated more categorically than Sage Vasishtha — that there was no difference between the dream that each of us dreams in the night (and sometimes even during the day) and the other (in the waking state) in which all of us are "lived". In the latter, the living-dream, there is no dreamer of the *one* dream, in which each of us is dreamed ("lived") and this-which-we-are is the *dreaming*. "I" dream the phenomenal universe and all that I dream can be nothing but "I", the noumenon. "I" who *am*, but not as "me", dream the universe, and "you" perceive it but not as "I".

The first thought ~~to~~ is the movement in consciousness-at-rest, or awareness, not aware of itself. This first thought — I AM — is impersonal thought, direct, im-mediate, "absolute thought", and is an objectivization of what-we-are as "I". Living according to such direct, impersonal thought — without the intervention of any intermediate suppositional entity — is the kind of life which a sage lives: apparently like any other individual but without identification as a separate entity, his actions being the spontaneous translations of direct thought in which there is no individual thinker.

The other kind of thought, totally different is that which arises after consciousness has mistakenly identified itself with as a separate suppositional entity as a pseudo-subject, thereby subjecting itself to the apparent "bondage". Any thought proceeding through the intermediacy of such an entity is also objectivization, but such thought, not being spontaneous, ~~and~~ im-mediate, and direct, cannot be an objectivization of what-we-are as "I".

There is the story, almost certainly apocryphal, that the ādi-Shankaracharya ran away and took shelter when he saw a rogue elephant rushing at him. There were some irreverent remarks, and the explanation provided by the sage was that the elephant, himself and the incident were all appearances in consciousness, phenomenal objectivization of the noumenon. Shri Nisargadatta Maharaj, when he was asked what he would do in certain given circumstances, replied in all simplicity, "I don't know."

It is only dualistic thought of an intermediate thinker which gets <u>translated</u> into volitional action. Pure, direct immediate thought gets <u>reflected</u> into pure, direct, intuitive action. One is bondage, the other is not.

Someone is deeply convinced that he was Alexander of Macedonia, someone else that she was an Egyptian princess, and many others "remember" who they were in "a previous life" (it is curious that no one seems to remember being a slave!). The fact of the matter is that they are all perfectly right. All phenomena, anywhere, at any time, can never be anything other than "I", the noumenon. "I" have never been alive, never been born, can never be dead. So I too have been Chengiz Khan, Abraham Lincoln, Hitler — and Churchill too!

---

36 It must be difficult to calculate how much energy we expend every moment in the ever present struggle to resist the pull of gravity. But it must be so considerable that when we think of a burden, it is always in terms of weight; indeed the problems that "weigh" on our minds surely take its measure of suffering, though notionally, from the illustration of the unrelenting incessant gravity? Whether it would be practical to free our bodies from the pull of gravity is another matter but the fact at the moment is that we cannot do so. Could we not, however, free our minds from the weight of problems? The fact of the matter is that "we" cannot free "our" minds any more than we can free "our" bodies. However, what can certainly be done is to free both our minds and our bodies of our "selves" as being separate from "others" by apperceiving that both "self" and "others" being interdependent, their complement results in mutual negation when seen as "self and others", the absense of which is what-we-are. Without our "selves", the concept of weight and burden would be irrelevant.

To say that "Life's a dream" is to say something remarkably more accurate than what might appear, because both our "living-activity" and our "sleeping-activity" are astonishingly similar as dreams, both in kind and in origin. What-we-are as noumenon is also every phenomenal object in our living-dream even if the objects manifest two apparently opposing aspects — the interrelated opposites are dual aspects of what-we-are subjectively undivided. Action as such is, therefore, both "lived" and "live-ing" since, ~~truly~~ there is truly only *dreaming*, neither the dreamed nor the dreamer, neither God nor man, neither creator nor creature. True action ~~thus~~ in life is thus "no-action" since there is no entity to perform it, nor is any "thing" performed — all is spontaneity, what science has started calling "self-generated process".

In the living-dream you think that you act, but what you ~~act~~ do is to act the role of the "you"; all the time, however, what is happening is ~~that~~ "you" are being dreamed by *what-you-are*. ~~as "I"~~ Actually, however, since you are being dreamed by *what-you-are*, you are in fact the dreaming of both your action and of the act*er* of the action. In other words, all that can be said is that you are the act*ing* of the action. You are both dreamed and dreaming; there is neither the dreamer nor any *thing* dreamed, only the actual current dream*ing* of phenomenality and what is dreamed as the apparent universe is composed of the consciousness which is dreaming it; each object dreamed is also itself the dreaming.

37 If you are "dreamed", who is dreaming? All kinds ~~of~~ and degrees of dreaming are phenomenal and presume a functioning of ~~a~~ consciousness which must necessarily be awake in order to dream — otherwise it would be "deep sleep". The dreaming function, always awake, must, therefore, necessarily be noumenal functioning, sometimes called *Prajnya*.

All appearances are part of the living-dream, and the perception, and the conceptual interpretation of that perception, takes place through the instrumentation of the dreamed objects, through which interpretive functioning appears the universe. In effect, therefore, everything is dreamt by sentient "beings", their own personal dreams being micro~~scopic~~cosmic reproductions of the living-dream in which they themselves are dreamt. The essential identity between the personal dream and the living-dream, confirmed by many Masters, is easy enough to understand. What presents a certain amount of difficulty is the question of awakening. Who is it that wakes up in the personal dream? If it is the dreamer who wakes up in the personal dream, who wakes up (by way of enlightenment) in the living-dream? The difficulty resolves itself if it is understood that in both kinds of dream there is no dreamer as such, only dreaming. Awakening from the personal dream happens when there is realization that what was happening in the night was only dreaming and not "real". Awakening from the living-dream happens similarly when there is realization as such that what happens in the waking state is itself a dream. There is really no dreamer as such to "whom" the awakening happens in either ~~case~~ kind of dream. Awakening is a state which occurs as soon as there is realization (not to any illusory, unfounded entity) as such that it is all a dream.

There will be no difficulty in comprehending the situation if it is firmly kept in mind that everything happens in consciousness — the dream itself, the dreamed objects, the perceiving and cognizing and their interpretation in duality. The deep sleep state, the dreaming state and the waking state are all states in consciousness, and the sentient "beings", far from being autonomous entities, are merely organs of interpretation for the noumenal functioning. Awakening from the personal dream leads into the waking state of the living-dream. Awakening from the phenomenal living-dream leads into noumenality.

38

The truth is so simple to see that it gets often overlooked: what-we-appear-to-be will forever be what we appear to be — an appearance in consciousness, and what-we-are can never be anything other than what we are, what we always have been since "time" ever was — infinite intemporality. And, what is important, what-we-are cannot see what we are except as what-we-appear-to-be.

Awakening can not be a personal experience. Awakening is a flash of sudden understanding that is im-mediate or non-mediate, an understanding as such, without a comprehender. Awakening means understanding intemporality, and therefore cannot happen in duration. In fact, when awakening happens, the only "experience" generally has been that Time stood still! Something somewhere, — not necessarily anything new — suddenly creates an unprecedent impact, and the phenomenon reacts with a shock, for instance, it may suddenly stop what it was doing, or bring its hands together in a vibrant clap. It is important to understand that the psyche is not capable of "*registering*" such a "sudden" occurrence because the psyche is a phenomen in space-time extension, and therefore such "awakening" cannot be a personal psychosomatic "experience". But a phenomenon could be the medium through which it happens, and on which the *impact* could produce an *affect*

The tri-dimensional "form" can be *perceived* only from a direction of measurement beyond the three dimensions of volume, that is to say, time or duration. After a further direction of measurement (beyond duration) becomes available to the psyche, when there is "awakening" (intemporality), form loses its tri-dimensional "reality". In other words, the three-dimensional volume was included in duration, and now the knowledge of intemporality includes the earlier dimensions of volume plus temporality. It is for this reason that the "awakened" continue to perceive as they did earlier.